

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 521

EA 004 041

AUTHOR Schmuck, Richard A.; Nelson, Jack E.  
TITLE The Principal as Convener of Organizational Change.  
Research Reports in Educational Administration, Vol. II, No. 2.  
INSTITUTION Colorado Univ., Boulder. Bureau of Educational Research.  
PUB DATE Oct 70  
NOTE 21p.  
AVAILABLE FROM "Research Reports," Bureau of Educational Research, Helles Annex 151, School of Education, Univ. of Colorado, Boulder 80302 (\$1.50 each)  
  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS \*Administrator Role; \*Change Agents; Decision Making; \*Organizational Change; Organizational Climate; \*Principals; \*Problem Solving; Role Theory; Social Psychology

ABSTRACT

The authors propose that a principal, instead of making all decisions himself, should convene faculty, staff, and student groups to help bring conflict into the open and to work on organizational problems systematically. This "team-leader" role assumes that team members are intelligent, competent, and want to perform well; and that an open organizational climate with high trust and esprit facilitates group problem solving procedures. (RA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 060521

EA 004 041

TRAINING

RESEARCH

SERVICE

DBER



Bureau of Educational Research

151 Hellems Annex

University of Colorado

Boulder, Colorado 80302

Subscription rate - 9 issues,  
\$10.00 per year. Individual  
copies priced at \$1.50 each.

Myrle Hemenway, Acting Director

THE PRINCIPAL AS CONVENER OF  
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

by

Richard A. Schmuck  
and  
Jack E. Nelson

Vol. II, No. 2

October, 1970

### About the Authors

Richard A. Schmuck is Professor of Educational Psychology and a Research Associate in CASEA, The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Jack E. Nelson is a Research Assistant in CASEA and a former secondary school principal in the Beaverton, Oregon school district.

The authors have demonstrated success in working with school faculties and administrators to effect planned change. Schmuck and Nelson call attention to the "Organizational Problem-Solving Process" on page 12. Additional information about this process can be obtained by contacting the authors at:

CASEA  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon 97403  
Telephone: 342-1411, Ext. 2531

The principal as a convenor of organizational change is appropriate reading for Colorado educators. We think that it is also a reading "must" for Colorado superintendents and school board members who strongly influence the principals' role.

The Editor

James Rose



## THE PRINCIPAL AS CONVENER OF ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEM SOLVING

by

Richard A. Schmuck and Jack E. Nelson

A new role for the principal is beginning to appear in American education--a role that brings a new sort of educational leadership to building staffs. It is emerging as a vehicle for coping with rapidly increasing sizes of buildings and districts. It responds to a changing educational culture, one that is striving to become more and more democratic. The new role involves convening staff members for problem solving and group decision making.

Increases in size have led to more complex role structures and organizational procedures in schools. At the district level, assistant superintendents, directors, and specialists have been added; while in buildings, staffs have been supplemented with vice-principals, counselors, and resource teachers. Even the roles of department head and area coordinator have broadened, and demands for more differentiated roles within buildings are constantly gaining momentum. For the principal, this has meant a lengthened vertical hierarchy, creating more distance between himself and the superintendent on the one hand, and between his classroom teachers and himself on the other. Although many specialized roles have been added to school districts, principals still are spending increasingly larger periods of off-duty time on the job.<sup>1</sup>

These alterations in the organizational complexity of schools have been accompanied by increased militancy of teachers. The 1960's brought a rapid increase of teacher strikes. Williams<sup>2</sup> claimed that 80 percent of the man-hours lost in education due to work stoppages between 1940 and 1968 occurred during 1967-68. In that academic year 114 teachers' strikes took place, accounting for more than one-third of all the strikes over a 28-year period.

All indications nationally point to even more strikes during the 1970's.

Teacher militancy has led to collective bargaining which, in turn, has resulted in teachers circumventing principals and specialists to negotiate for salaries, other benefits, and modifications in curriculum. More and more teachers negotiate directly with their board on matters that once were primarily the responsibility of the superintendent or principal. Even so, the day-to-day grievances of teachers continue to be addressed primarily to their building principal.

#### A New Role

In the October, 1969 edition of the National Association of Secondary School Principal's Bulletin, we described an organizational training program with a junior high school that has led us to devise a new role for the principal. The first author of this paper was the leader of the organizational training team in that project; the second author was the principal of the school. The role functions within a team of staff members to broaden the locus of decision making to make use of the strengths and resources of the faculty. The principal as a single role taker makes fewer decisions on his own compared with a traditional role-model. Mostly, he guides groups through problem solving and stimulates all members to participate actively.

It is important to point out that we do not have in mind a human-relations approach where people relate merely in pleasant and non-confrontative ways. On the contrary, in our conception and experience, the principal performs as the facilitator of a team, or as the convener of several groups in interaction, to help bring conflict into the open and to work on organizational problems systematically. Often, this role leads to uncomfortable



interactions and to difficult interpersonal confrontations. The emphasis we place on the role is to energize and systematize group problem solving and decision making.

Several assumptions about the ways schools operate underlie this suggested role. First, we assume that the organizational processes of a school, especially those involving the use of staff resources, set the stage for successful instruction and innovation. Second, we think that many principals have attempted to explain away the major problems of their schools by emphasizing the inferior nature of resources instead of focusing on the process of using resources. It is true that the quality of resources, whether they are competent students, effective teachers, or contemporary curriculum materials, is important. Nevertheless, more attention should be placed by principals on improving the group processes in their schools. Our third assumption is that it is the interaction of students, teachers, and curriculum materials in all their various relationships that determine the efficient use of the school's resources.

From our point of view, the school is more than simply the total of the individuals' resources and the curriculum materials. The staff as a group has different characteristics from those of its individual members; and, if it is effectively managed, it may be more productive than would be expected from a simple summing up of individual resources. To the extent that the principal is able to work efficiently to maximize production from whatever resources he is given, we would declare him to be an effective convener of organizational problem solving.

The new role's cognitive components should comprise an understanding of McGregor's theory of motivation.<sup>3</sup> His Theory Y assumed that persons are

curious and active, that they want to perform well, and that being stimulated by others at work can be very satisfying. McGregor pointed out that many leaders in organizations hold quite different assumptions which he labeled Theory X. Theory X assumes that persons must be prodded to perform and that people must be strictly controlled if they are to pursue organizational goals. Typically, Theory X encourages unilateral decisions by superordinates and one-way communication in contrast to two-way. Theory Y, on the other hand, encourages a participative leadership style. It assumes that persons should be granted leeway and freedom to organize themselves; and, if they are guided through such an open climate, that they will make maximum use of their mutual resources.

Principals taking the new role should also understand that emotional experiences can become problems when desires for achievement, affiliation, and power are frustrated. Typical emotional frustrations are feelings of inferiority, worthlessness, being "put down," loneliness, betrayal, lack of interest, and dullness; these feelings, in turn, prevent persons from making maximum use of their potential whether emotional, cognitive, or behavioral. It is true that a principal cannot manage his school so that all emotional frustrations are eliminated. Nevertheless, with skills in group facilitation, it is possible to bring about organizational norms and procedures that will mobilize emotional states for productive ends. Feelings of achievement can be harnessed when teachers have a clear concept of their goals. Affiliative feelings can be gratified through building cohesive units in which teachers find friendliness and the reciprocal exchange of support and warmth. Feelings having to do with power can be satisfied through the principal's encouraging influence at all levels.

Such a dispersion of influence will facilitate the open expression of frustration.

The new role also should include information about group techniques for increasing the flow of communication. One technique useful in face-to-face meetings is the so-called fishbowl. When using this procedure, one group sits surrounded by another. Usually, the outside group observes the insiders, the outside observers having been provided with particular categories to guide their observation. A variation of the fishbowl, also useful, is a formation in which two or three empty chairs are left in the inside group and members of the outside group are invited to enter when they choose to communicate something to the insiders. For additional ideas about innovations in group leadership techniques, see Miles<sup>4</sup>, Schmuck and Runkel<sup>5</sup>, and Langmeyer, Schmuck, and Runkel.<sup>6</sup>

Performing effectively as the convener of problem-solving places new demands on the principal. Benevolence and warm paternalism are no longer virtues. Rather, empathic understanding is required along with willingness to enter into uncomfortable confrontations. The communication skills of paraphrasing, describing behavior, describing own feelings, perception checking, summarizing, and gatekeeping are important behaviors to establish constructive openness during problem solving.<sup>7</sup> Unilateral decision making is not usually appropriate, but openness about one's own feelings engendered by the role of principal is needed to strengthen trust with the staff.

When teachers are confronted with behaviors of a principal that are at variance with what they have come to expect, it is quite understandable that they should be distrustful. Much of their experience has taught

them that authority figures not only do not behave democratically and trustfully, but that in many instances they should not do so. Our interpretation of teachers' behavior is that they initially react to a less controlling principal as a phoney or as "playing a game" to protect themselves from the risks implicit in potential engagement on more democratic terms. It is important for the principal taking the new role to persist in it over a long period of time to gain the confidence of his staff.

Perhaps the most important behavior necessary to carry out the new role effectively has to do with guiding group problem solving. It seems fair to assume that most principals and teachers have been trained to take positions of high control and to direct single-handedly the activities of the staff or of a group of students. But they have not been trained to work collaboratively with adult professionals.

Problem-solving skills, in themselves, are not difficult to learn. Many principals have at least a passing acquaintance with the procedures of problem-definition, data collection, brainstorming, examining alternatives, and so forth. At issue for the principal are the operational and behavioral implications of the concept of collaboration for problem solving. These are, minimally, the willingness to engage on a level of mutual influence, the willingness to expose vested interests, and an active concern for organizational goals. In other words, though behavioral skills are very important, the attitudinal correlates of these skills are critical. At the very least, this new role of the principal must include the sincere willingness to share power.

Generally, the TAs indicated high job satisfaction but expressed some personal concerns and recommendations for change. This information was then relayed to the Curriculum Associates by the DS Coordinators. Several changes are occurring and different results appear to be emerging during the second year of the experimental phase. A copy of the actual log sheets used is found in Appendix B.

Reactions from other staff members at Parker and Spring Creek about the role and performance of the TA have been mixed. Staff members feel most positive about the assistance that TAs provide to individuals and small groups of students, the working relationship between TAs and other staff members, and the willingness with which the TAs have performed the tasks requested of them. On the other hand, staff members have been concerned with the difficulty in trying to develop a new role for the district, with identifying when a TA can and cannot work with students on his own, and in overcoming the feelings that the TA is another clerical aide.

Some district personnel (not directly teaching or working in the DS schools) have expressed concern about the future impact of the TA program as it relates to protecting educators. The most usual question from those connected to the professional teaching associations is, "If you can hire three Teaching Assistants for the same amount as one teacher, what is to prevent boards and administrators from replacing some teachers with Teaching Assistants?" The response of the DS Coordinators has been that of recognizing that a potential problem exists and that a solution will have to be found. We do not have the answer ready this instant, but we do feel that the answer is not to abolish the TA position. One of the recommendations in the

following section relates to this issue.

The other major issue, primarily among those involved in personnel practices in the district, is the question of how much time should the TA work directly with students, and what kinds of activities should the TA be allowed to conduct with them. The development of the TA position to date indicates to the DS Coordinators a strong need to produce a clear and concise description of the TA role, with specific guidelines for time allotments for the TAs activities with students. This is necessary to prevent the use of TAs as substitutes for absent teachers, and insure that TAs will not be expected to plan lessons, conduct the activities, and evaluate students. Planning lessons, conducting activities, and evaluating students are aspects of the role of the certificated teacher. Only the second of these, that of conducting activities, should properly be included in the TA role; indeed, it is the basic function of the TA. A second recommendation of the next section is offered as part of the response for those concerns.

In summary, the data so far indicate that Teaching Assistants are generally performing the tasks originally expected of them in the position. Further, there has been no emerging effort on the part of the Spring Creek and Parker staffs to seek more Teaching Assistants by releasing some of their certified teachers. Finally, neither staff has demonstrated a willfull intent to misuse the Teaching Assistants in any way. In fact, there has been a concerted effort in both schools to be extremely careful that the TAs are not misused and that they are asked to perform only their expected role.



RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are proposed by the DS Coordinators after studying the data gathered to date and after much deliberation and consultation with the Personnel Director, Area Directors, principals and teachers in the DS schools, and the Teaching Assistants themselves. They are presented as ideas for the beginning of further discussion and negotiation about the role of the TA and its potential for the Eugene School District.

The first recommendation addresses itself to the issue raised by many professional educators, namely, that the Teaching Assistant program is a major potential threat to teachers because approximately three Teaching Assistants can be employed for one average teaching salary. The recommendation has the following four components:

- 1) We propose that the district board and administration consider a major change in the budget allotments for the staffing of schools. It is suggested that an allotment be established, as is presently the case, for the provision of a necessary number of professional and clerical staff.
- 2) A basic change we propose is that the district in addition establish a flexible allotment for staffing each school. There would be no restrictions on the use of this allotment for either professional or non-certified staff. However, each school staff would be required to show evidence to the administration of having evaluated its needs for staff, to indicate to the administration the intended utilization of personnel acquired from the flexible allotment, and to provide a plan of

action for evaluating the results of that staff performance.

The flexible allotment would allow each staff to decide whether the needs of the program would best be met by the use of TAs or of other specialists.

- 3) It is proposed that a school with a well-designed plan for staffing and evaluation of its program at a designated time could request the addition of Teaching Assistants from the monies allotted for certificated or non-certificated staff. It is suggested at this time, however, that a limit be set upon the amount of money that could be used from either allotment.
- 4) Finally, it is suggested that the EEA TEPS committee, the District Personnel Director, and the area directors work jointly with the DS Coordinators and the TAs to develop final guidelines for the previous three sections of this recommendation. These guidelines would be completed by June, 1972.

The second recommendation relates directly to the role of the Teaching Assistant, and proposes the acceptance of the position in the district's staffing pattern as an alternative way of providing education for students. The recommendation is as follows:

We propose that the Teaching Assistant position be accepted as a regular position in the staffing pattern of the Eugene School District. Acceptance of this proposal would not necessarily provide each school in the district to have an equal number of TAs. It would mean that the position is available for schools that determine that Teaching Assistants could help them to improve the program

in that school. We mean that the district will have a set of guidelines for selecting Teaching Assistants, a description of the actual roles that the TA can perform, and a policy stating who is responsible for supervision and evaluation of the TA. It is suggested that these guidelines be developed by the same group formed in recommendation number 1.

A final recommendation is that the five elementary schools presently participating in the DS Project be provided monies to continue the Teaching Assistant Program. This provision would cover the transitional period until the studies are completed regarding the methods of budgeting in schools, the final rate of pay, and the TA role description. It is proposed that an increase in salary be granted to those TAs who have worked for one or two years in the project's experimental phase. It is further recommended that the monies needed for this recommendation be drawn from the present budget allotment for the experimental phase of the DS Project.

#### A FINAL REMARK

In summary, we strongly recommend that the Teaching Assistant position be established in the district as another alternative way to organize staffs for instruction. The data indicate very positive outcomes from the program to date. Recognizing the various concerns and problems also indicated by the data, the DS Coordinators will continue through the rest of this year to make the adjustments necessary to overcome the concerns.

We are convinced that the recommendations proposed in this report are realistic for the district in terms of how the district can finance such a program, how guidelines should be established for further development of the Teaching Assistant role, and what requirements must be placed upon school staffs that decide to utilize the services of the TA.

## Appendix A

### EUGENE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

#### Differentiated Staffing Project May, 1970

#### PARAPROFESSIONAL ROLE ANALYSIS

##### Description

The paraprofessional shall provide instructional assistance to the certified staff. The main responsibility will be to serve as teaching technician, performing a number of teaching tasks with students.

##### Specific Functions

- 1) Provide individual research help for students seeking assistance.
- 2) Serve as listener and helper to small reading groups.
- 3) Serve as a discussion leader for large or small groups.
- 4) Seek out information and materials for instruction by self or other unit staff members.
- 5) Provide assistance to teachers in analyzing individual student progress.
- 6) Assist teachers in the creation of learning packages or programs.
- 7) Operate audio-visual aids for groups of students.
- 8) Salary and contract hours are presently being considered.

##### Personal Qualities Desired

- 1) Demonstrates positive attitude toward children.
- 2) Demonstrates awareness of educational goals and objectives.
- 3) Possesses ability to relate positively with other adults.
- 4) Demonstrates ability to follow instructions and carry out necessary tasks.
- 5) Demonstrates desire to improve self skills and instructional skills necessary to the position.

# Appendix B

## EUGENE PUBLIC SCHOOLS Differentiated Staffing Project Instructional Assistants Log - 1970-71

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_ DAY \_\_\_\_\_  
LOGGED \_\_\_\_\_

A. Estimate the time in minutes spent on each task.

TASK		NO. OF MINUTES				
		Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri
1.	Working with Total Class of Students					
	a. Discussion					
	b. Reading to class					
	c. Hearing pupils read					
	d. Operating audio-visual aids					
	e. Administrrating assignments & monitoring tests					
2.	Working with Small Student Groups					
	a. Discussion					
	b. Skill reinforcement - Conducting drill exercises					
	c. Hearing pupils read					
	d. Assisting with student research					
3.	Working with Individual Students					
	a. Reinforcement of skills					
	b. Assisting with student research					
	c. Desk to desk individual help					
	d. Reading to a student					
	e. Hearing a student read					
4.	Working with Staff					
	a. Seeking out materials					
	b. Attending meetings					
	c. Assisting with Evaluation of Students					



	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri
5. Clerical Duties					
a. Reproducing test, worksheets, transparencies					
b. Constructing materials (bulletin boards, games, etc.)					
c. Correcting papers and tests					
d. Housekeeping					
e. Hearing a student read					
6. Supervision Duties					
a. Recess supervision					
b. Noon duty					
c. Halls supervision					
d. Field trips					
7. Working Alone					
a. Planning					
b. Research					

B. List difficulties or problems encountered during the week. How were they resolved?

C. List any tasks performed that do not fit the categories in section A. How much time did the tasks take?

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

- 1) From whom do you receive most of your supervision?
- 2) With whom do you spend most of your time planning for what you do?
- 3) Discuss any general thoughts or feelings about the position of Teaching Assistant (paraprofessional) that you might have at this time.
- 4) Are there any particular kinds of training programs that you think would be beneficial at this time in assisting you in fulfilling your responsibilities better?

### Support for the New Role

Research in social psychology lends support to the role of the principal as a convener of problem solving. Findings reveal that it is possible to create relationships among individuals comprising a face-to-face group so that the group exhibits properties different from those properties observed in typical committees, staff groups, or task forces in everyday organizational life.<sup>8</sup> The more effective groups have leaders who allow for greater participation, wider initial divergence of expressed judgments, and greater acceptance of diverse decisions.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, effective leaders have been shown to encourage minority opinions and conflict to a greater extent than less effective leaders.<sup>10</sup> Also, it has been shown that group participants with little influence over a decision not only fail to contribute their resources to the decision but usually are less likely to carry out the decision when action is required.<sup>11</sup>

Evidence comes directly from research on schools also. Gross and Herriott examined the consequences of the professional leadership exhibited by elementary school principals on the operation of their schools. To measure the effects of the leadership behavior of principals on their staffs, the researchers examined the relationship between the principal's scores on a measure of Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) and three characteristics of schools that are widely accepted as meaningful criteria of effectiveness: staff morale, the professional performance of teachers, and the students' learning. Gross and Herriott found positive and significant relationship between EPL and each of these three variables. EPL was defined as the efforts of a principal of a school to conform to a definition of his role that stresses his obligation to improve the quality of the

performance of his staff. This role is in many ways similar to that of the convener for problem solving.

The results of the study described in the NASSP Bulletin in which the principal was trained in the role of convener of problem solving showed that the principal gained significantly in his EPL scores after the training. Much of the training in that project was aimed at increasing two-way communication of feelings between the principal and his teachers. The training also focused on increasing the effectiveness of the Principal's Advisory Committee as a team and on increasing communicative linkages between the principal and the teachers by direct training in communicative skills and problem solving.

The studies by Gross and Herriott and by Schmuck and Runkel both tell us that effectiveness in problem solving on performance is likely to be improved by increasing a professional peer relationship between the principal and his staff. Both studies emphasized trust-building, authenticity, and genuineness in the behavior of the principal.<sup>12</sup> Watkins<sup>13</sup> clearly showed that principals who maintained close and informal relationships with teachers also had a school in which there was an open climate, high esprit, and high trust. Finally, Chesler, Schmuck, and Lippitt<sup>14</sup> showed that principals who had innovating staffs were tuned to their teachers' feelings and values and were better informed about their informal relationships.

#### Examples of New Role

Although the role of principal as convener of organizational problem solving is just beginning to take shape as a viable role, a few examples of this role in action have been documented.

(1) In a junior high school, we helped form the Principal's Advisory Committee into more of a problem-solving group. The principal served as the group facilitator. The group met bimonthly for one hour before classes began. At the committee's request an additional 6:30 A.M. breakfast meeting lasting 2-1/2 hours was scheduled the last Friday of each month. Members very rarely missed these meetings. When an area chairman could not attend, he asked a member of his subject area to take his place. On several occasions, general faculty members were invited to attend these meetings; typically two or three would appear and participate. This Advisory Committee facilitated organizational problem solving in the school in several ways. The principal acted to help decisions, to keep communication flowing, and to help less active teachers to participate.

(2) In an elementary school, we helped the staff form into a multi-unit structure. The principal formed a leadership team with five unit leaders (master teachers), a curriculum resource librarian, and a counselor. Each unit leader formed a team with three or four other teachers and several aides (either student teachers from a nearby university or volunteer adults from the community). No self-contained classrooms existed in the building. The principal served as a convener for the leadership group which, in turn, integrated the instructional efforts of the various units. Key decisions for new instructional strategies were made by the units, and innovations in overall curriculum and organizational policies were decided upon by the leadership group. Power, in general, was placed more in the hands of teams of teachers. The principal kept the whole communication process active and clear.

(3) In an experimental high school, the principal became concerned that low achieving students, primarily a group of culturally disadvantaged Black students, were not advancing very well in the basic skills (especially reading and writing). He decided to hold a meeting with a group of Black students to discuss how they saw the school. Most of these students reported that they liked the freedom in the school, but they also wanted to learn to read and write so that jobs would be easier to get. Unfortunately, the teachers in this experimental school wanted to teach problem solving and systematic inquiry, mostly in lieu of teaching remedial reading. The principal was able to work as a convener of problem solving by arranging for the Black students to give their feedback directly to the relevant teachers. He set up a meeting and used several techniques described elsewhere.<sup>15</sup>

(4) In another high school, the principal has decided to take a leave of absence for one year to go to graduate school at the University of Oregon to learn skills of consulting. With the permission of his staff, he will serve as an organizational consultant to his own school during that year. He hopes to help the staff to organize itself for organizational decision making so that the teachers and specialists will become involved in more and more decisions in small teams. He wants to construct the role of the principal as convener of organizational problem solving.

#### Implementing the New Role

The introduction of a more democratic, team-oriented, teacher decision-making structure calls for very direct and decisive action on the part of the principal. He must be ready to initiate the sort of



organizational process he believes will yield the most productive results; the ultimate responsibility for decisions in buildings lies with him. The special effect of the new role we have been discussing, however, results from the principal's facilitation of problem solving by others and from his restraint from doing jobs that might be done by others closer to the point of application.

Our assessment of the existing role indicates that there are many opportunities for the principal to be a convener. He can organize a formal decision-making body that best fits his style. It may be charged with topics ranging from spending discretionary funds to the best use of rooms. Through such a group, a large faculty can be represented effectively, and knowledge of a problem can be widely shared well in advance of the time action is to be accomplished. In this setting, the principal does not need to be the "boss," but can assume the role of facilitator. A regularly scheduled bimonthly meeting has proved to be effective.

Another opportunity for the principal as convener can almost always be found among the chief administrative jobs of the school. In a weekly meeting, information concerning the general management of the school can be shared such as information from the central office, desires from the faculty, and information from informal channels. By determining the best solutions, many problems involving poor communications on the staff can be avoided. A second regular half-hour meeting can be used for rapid collection of up-to-the-minute news for the bulletin. Pertinent information about the next weeks' events can get to the total staff before their departure for the weekend.

Another opportunity occurs early in the fall. At that time, in regularly scheduled meetings, the principal and first-year teachers can explore their unique concerns and problems. The principal can use this opportunity for open discussion of school policy, generation of mutual respect and trust, and a sensing of potential difficulties.

The principal can employ volunteer interest groups within the faculty to do a great deal of pre-planning for curricular innovation. He should not overlook ad hoc groups to work on special problems such as orientation of new students, problems unique to scheduling parental visits, and public relations with the community. He can contribute his expertise to these groups, as well as that of district consultants, curriculum specialists, and other resources available. Problems relating to budget, personnel, and space can be discussed before concrete proposals are formulated. These groups should be convened in the early spring or fall to meet budget deadlines for the following fiscal year.

In many of these team sessions the principal can facilitate the performance of the group and implement his role as a convener by using an organizational problem-solving process. Space does not allow us to include detailed description of this seven stage process, however, mimeographed materials are available by writing to the authors at CASEA.

#### Possible Consequences of the New Role

Once the principal uses the problem-solving process and once a new decision-making pattern has been established, a number of consequences can be predicted that are not necessarily related to the new role itself. For example, after the principal has shared power with others on some important

matters, he cannot easily retrieve it by fiat. Thus, while he makes the decision initially to share his power, it is typically risky for him to reverse his stance; the probable result is organizational stress and a lowered trust from teachers.

Another consequence of the new role is an increase in the amount of time that will be consumed in solving problems and making decisions. Problems that the principal may have decided on his own in a short time may take hours of the group's deliberation. This can be frustrating and the principal must be able to deal with his own frustration and that of his teachers. The willingness of the principal to tolerate this increase in time may even sometimes seem to the teachers to corroborate their fear that he is "playing a game" and is only waiting for them to fail. The principal must be able to suffer through these periods.

Changing the formal structure also has consequences for the informal structure. For example, a danger is that decision-making teams working with the principal can become "inner circles." The members have easier access to power than the rest of the faculty. This suggests that unless this development is foreseen and plans made to deal with it, a large group of staff members may drift toward the periphery. The main issues of importance seem to be to (1) insure a free flow of data about suspicious and negative feelings, (2) diagnose the nature of the problems that appear, and (3) initiate appropriate actions to resolve problem situations.

The difficulties listed above are ever present, but they can be met with determination and skill on the part of the principal and his advisors. It is our belief, backed by the studies and experiences already cited, that greater use of the human resources throughout the school and a greater

commitment by the staff to the school's goals will emerge when the principal acts regularly to convene problem-solving activities and makes use of objective problem-solving procedures.

## FOOTNOTES

\*The research detailed here was supported by The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. CASEA is a national research and development center established under the Cooperative Research Program of the U. S. Office of Education. We wish to thank Philip Runkel and Mary Ann Smith for their helpful contributions to this manuscript.

\*\*Richard A. Schmuck is professor of educational psychology and a research associate at the Center for The Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon. Jack Nelson is a research assistant at The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

## REFERENCES

1. See especially, Rawlins, M., A Career Pattern Study of Secondary School Principals in Los Angeles City Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1964; or Gross, N. and Herriott, R., Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: Wiley, 1965; or Rock, D. and Hemphill, J., "Report of the Junior High-School Principalship," National Convention of NASSP, Washington, D. C., 1966.
2. See, Williams, R., "Teacher Militancy: Implications for the Schools." Prepublication prepared by ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration, University of Oregon, November, 1969.
3. McGregor, D., The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
4. Miles, M., Learning to Work in Groups. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
5. Schmuck, R., and Runkel, P., Organizational Training for a School Faculty. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1970.
6. Langmeyer, D., Schmuck, R., and Runkel, P., Technology for Organizational Training in Schools. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969.
7. These communication skills are described and elaborated in Schmuck, R., and Schmuck, P., Group Processes in the Classroom. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown and Company Publishers, forthcoming.
8. Hall, J., and Williams, M., "Group Dynamics Training and Improved Decision Making," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 6, No. 1., 1970, pps. 39-68.
9. Torrance, E. P., "Group Decision-Making and Disagreement," Social Forces, Vol. 35, 1957, pps. 314-318.
10. Maier, N., and Solem, A., "The Contribution of a Discussion Leader to the Quality of Group Thinking: The Effective Use of Minority Opinions," in Cartwright and Zander (Eds.), Group Dynamics, Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1953, pps. 561-572.
11. Coch, L. and French, J., "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Human Relations, Vol. 4, 1948, pps. 512-532.



12. For further explications of similar roles see: Gibb, J., "Expanding Role of the Administrator," The Bulletin of NASSP, Vol. 51, No. 319, May, 1967, pps. 46-60; or Myers, D., The Art of Decision-Making in the Principal and the Challenge of Change. Los Angeles: Institute for Development of Educational Activities Monograph, 1968, pps. 85-103
13. Watkins, J. F., "An Inquiry Into the Principal-Staff Relationship," The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 63, No. 1, September, 1969.
14. Chesler, M., Schmuck, R., and Lippitt, R., "The Principal's Role in Facilitating Change," Theory Into Practice, Vol. 2, Dec., 1963, pps. 269-277.
15. Blake, R., Mouton, J., and Sloma, R., "The Union-Management Intergroup Laboratory: Strategy for Resolving Intergroup Conflict," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 1., No. 1, 1965.

**"RESEARCH REPORTS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION"  
PER-YEAR MANUSCRIPTS FOR PUBLICATION COPIES  
SHOULD BE MAILED TO:**

**DR. JAMES ROSE, EDITOR  
RESEARCH REPORTS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION  
HELEMS ANNEX  
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO  
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302**

**COPIES OF "RESEARCH REPORTS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION"  
CHASED AT \$1.50 EACH FROM THE FOLLOWING:**

**BUREAU OF EDUCATION  
HELEMS ANNEX  
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO  
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302**

**ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AT \$10.00 PER YEAR AND**



ON" IS PUBLISHED NINE TIMES  
RATION ARE SOLICITED. THEY

ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATION" CAN BE PUR-  
E

SEARCH

AVAILABLE